

The Classical Weekly

Published on Monday, October 1 to May 31, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday (Election Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas Day, New Year's Day, Lincoln's Birthday, Washington's Birthday, Easter Sunday, Decoration Day). Place of Publication, Barnard College, New York City. In United States of America, \$2.00 per volume; elsewhere, \$2.50. Single numbers, 15 cents each. Address all communications to Charles Knapp, at 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City. Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized June 28, 1918.

VOL. XXIII, No. 20

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1930

WHOLE NO. 631

To be published in the spring THIRD LATIN BOOK

B. L. ULLMAN

Professor of Latin in the
University of Chicago

NORMAN E. HENRY

Head of the Latin Department,
Peabody High School, Pittsburgh

DORRANCE S. WHITE

Assistant Professor of Latin
in the University of Iowa

In addition to its exceptional fitness as a textbook in third-year Latin, this new book will have in its favor the important fact of its *continuity* with the tried and true Ullman and Henry textbooks for the first and second years. It will eliminate the waste and confusion of the textbook readjustment which has heretofore been necessary at the end of the second year.

This new book will be another addition to the Macmillan Classical Series, under the general editorship of B. L. Ullman.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

New York Boston Chicago Atlanta Dallas San Francisco

Just Published

Pearson and Lawrence's

LATIN II

654 pages Richly illustrated \$1.72

AN EXTRAORDINARILY good book for the teaching of second-year Latin. It follows closely the authors' LATIN I and conforms to the recommendations of the Classical Investigation, in regard to content and method.

Teachers will find that this book presents all the required work in second-year Latin in an interesting and effective manner. Here are combined the study of the postponed grammatical principles, all of the required readings in Caesar, and exercises in prose composition.

The typography, pictures, maps and binding make this a beautiful book

AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

The Classical Weekly

VOLUME XXIII, No. 20

MONDAY, MARCH 31, 1930

WHOLE NO. 631

THE CONTENT OF THE HIGH SCHOOL LATIN COURSE¹

The tumult and the shouting dies,
The captains and the kings depart,
Still stands thine ancient sacrifice....²

For over three years the Report of The Classical Investigation of the American Classical League has been before the public, and, through the width and length of our country, boards, associations, and committees have been busy reforming the High School Latin course in accordance with its recommendations. Daily the flood³ of new books is swelling, books which claim to "embody the recommendations of the Report". Verily, if, after all this mighty travail, the mountain should bring forth a mouse, it would seem a shame and a stigma upon our profession.

Yet a still small voice whispers again and again, Is it true, is it necessary, that all the traditions of generations of faithful laborers should be cast into the outer darkness? Is it true that, instead of the one objective which the fathers set before them, that of having the student acquire a fair command of Latin and a love of the great writers of antiquity, we shall be compelled to have twenty-one objectives, each to be kept constantly before the mind of the conscientious teacher? Please do not misunderstand me. I am by no means merely a *laudator temporis acti*, a hidebound conservative, who wishes to continue riding in the old Deadwood stage-coach in the age of express trains and air navigation. But I do think it worth while to pause, and, instead of simply accepting the verdict of twelve men good and true, to ponder it and apply to it my own experience and my own judgment.

Just which are the dominant and new views that the Report has brought forth? On page 79, we read that "the indispensable primary immediate objective is progressive development of power to read and understand Latin". Besides this, however, there are nine "ultimate objectives", seven to be emphasized from the beginning, namely, increased understanding of those elements in English which are related to Latin, increased ability to read, speak, and write English, development of an historical and cultural background, development of correct mental habits, development of right attitudes toward social institutions, increased ability to learn other foreign languages, and an elementary knowledge of the simpler

general principles of language structure. To these seven there are added, for the third year, development of literary appreciation, and, for the fourth year, improvement in the literary style of the pupil's written English.

Of these objectives the immediate one is, of course, not new; it has always been the aim proclaimed by teachers of Latin. Nor are the nine ultimate objectives new. Only, instead of being classed as objectives, they were commonly considered to be the spontaneous by-products of the successful teaching of Latin. As I see it, the dominant and new element in the Report is a concession to modern psychology. It is claimed by the psychologist that the achievement of these objectives is not spontaneous and unconscious, but that the teacher must purposely and consciously strive to achieve them. Since it is undoubtedly true that the objective must determine both content of course and method of teaching, it may well be worth our while to pause here for a moment and to consider the probable consequences of conceding the justice of this presentation in the Report.

About the immediate objective I think we are all in hearty agreement. We maintain, and have always maintained, that the power to read Latin rests on the study of the inflections of the language, its syntax, and its vocabulary, plus progressively increasing practice in reading Latin and the addition of a certain measure of practice in writing Latin, and that these are the sole means by which this objective can be realized. Of the ultimate objectives the first, described in the Report as understanding of English elements related to Latin, is merely in different language what has heretofore been called study of derivation and word-formation, something on which every wide-awake teacher of Latin has always insisted. But this must be coupled with number two, increased ability to speak, read, and write English. Strictly interpreted—and I know that some of those who had part in the Investigation wish so to interpret it—, this means that the word-material of the Latin to be placed before the pupils must be chosen with due regard to the English language. The question at once arises, Does the customary Latin vocabulary of the High School classroom, selected from Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil, furnish such material, or would it be necessary to go outside this field? I have attempted to answer this question for myself in the following way. Of the 10,000 words among 4,565,000 which are printed in E. L. Thorndike's *Teachers' Word-book*⁴, 242 words of Latin origin, that is, approxi-

¹This paper was read at the Ninth Annual Fall Meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, held at Atlantic City, New Jersey, November 11, 1927. <The delay in the publication of the paper in THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY is chargeable entirely to me. C. K. >

²Rudyard Kipling, The Recessional, Second Stanza.

³I should, in 1930, emend this word to 'avalanche'. C. K. >

⁴For some remarks on this work see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 16.113-114, 152, 19.152-153. C. K. >

mately 25 per cent., are found in Class 1, the thousand words first in importance. Of these 242 words, 47 are not found in Professor Lodge's List, while 39 are characterized by Professor Lodge as unimportant. This leaves 156, or 64 per cent. of the important words, as found in the vocabulary of the works of the three Latin writers traditionally read. If we add the 39 unimportant words, we find that the percentage reaches 80.6. Certainly, from the viewpoint of ultimate objectives one and two, we can hardly expect a change for the better through changing our reading material in Latin.

Ultimate objective six involves increased ability to learn other foreign languages. In this respect, another modest investigation of mine will be of interest. For an entirely different purpose 457 Latin words were selected as the originals from which French words and Spanish words prescribed in the French and the Spanish courses of the New York City High Schools have sprung. No attention whatever was paid to the question of their relation to the traditional Latin authors. Yet 281 of them, or 61.5 per cent., occur also in the word-list based on the Latin authors read in Schools and prescribed in the New York State Regents' Latin Syllabus. It would thus appear that a double check-up reveals no urgent need for an innovation in the reading material.

Ultimate objective four, the development of correct mental habits, has always been emphasized in our teaching. In fact, our opponents have often claimed that we were stressing this point unduly, and that, certainly, Latin has no monopoly in this field.

I must confess that ultimate objective seven, the gaining of an elementary knowledge of the simpler general language principles, defies my understanding. If the reference is to phonetic processes, such as assimilation, it will be only a subdivision of the first objective. If it means more than that, I am afraid that the pupil will carry away either a very hazy, or an absolutely incorrect, impression. Nor do I believe—and I willingly include myself among the multitude—that the general principles of language are so much a possession of the teacher of Latin that he could use them with any competency. Surely, this is an instance of *ignorare beatum*.

Ultimate objectives eight and nine, literary appreciation and improvement in the pupils' style, may be achieved, as the Report recognized, only in the higher grades, in the High Schools, and then certainly only, to use Quintilian's words, *optimis adsuescendo*. These two objectives thus, far from demanding a change, support rather the traditional choice of the authors whom the consent of the nations and the ages has acknowledged to be the finest exemplars of Latin style.

There remain, of the ultimate objectives, the third, development of an historical and cultural background, and the fifth, development of right attitudes toward social institutions. For the latter I may perhaps refer

to the introduction to the outline of the third-year work in the New York State Latin Syllabus of 1919, page 27, c, "training in politics and economics", and d, "training in ethical and moral conduct", in order to prove that this "objective" has been recognized for a number of years, and that, probably, the only startling thing about it is the wording, which seems to lend itself somewhat too readily to that kind of supervision of the teacher with which the name Lusk was, for a time, so notoriously connected in New York State. This leaves only the third objective. The title of a paper read by me twenty-six years ago before a teachers' meeting, Latin, An Historical Study, clearly shows what great store I used to set on this objective. *Sero sapiunt Phryges, sapiunt tamen aliquando*. To-day, I have receded from this one-sided view, and not merely *mobilitate animi*. Assuredly, for the understanding of a foreign literature the background of history and 'Kultur' is important; the student must develop a feeling for the environment and for the viewpoint of the foreign nation. But, while this demand is of vital importance in the study of a modern foreign language, since, in addition to the study of the literature, the possibility of personal and active contact must always be kept in mind because at any moment we may enter not only into private business relations, but also into official diplomatic and economic negotiations with those who use that foreign language, this 'utilitarian' aspect is absent from the study of Latin. It appears to me to-day that the chief value of the study of Latin is scholastic and esthetic. The part of heretic and *negator* is unpleasant, but I cannot help feeling that much of what the defenders of Latin say about its practical value is uttered by them with their tongues in their cheeks and is pronounced more for consumption abroad than within the fold. The great lessons of history and economics can probably be learned better from a familiar than from an unfamiliar past, and the representatives of the 'economic' interpretation of ancient history, I seem to notice, make much use of a process that is the reverse of the common claim about Latin, i. e. they attempt to understand ancient economics through the light of modern parallels. On the other hand, since, unfortunately, the true originator of great literature, Greece, seems fated for some time to come to remain in the background, the mass of High School pupils will have to seek their models among the Roman authors, and the reading in Latin in the Schools, should, therefore, be selected with this idea dominant.

If these reflections appear to you, I will not say cogent and convincing, but at least plausible and persuasive, the proper inferences must be drawn from them with reference to the reading content of our High School course in Latin, namely, that we must make our selections from the greatest writers of the Romans, and in so doing we must have an eye pre-eminently to beauty. That still leaves a wide field

of choice even for the most ardent reformer; at once there come to mind the elegiac poets for refinement of style and sheer beauty of sound and rhythm, Tacitus for his mastery of what Quintilian called the *genus pressum et sublime*, Livy for his Herodotean breadth of narrative, and Seneca for purity of sentiment. It would seem that only in oratory is our choice limited, since, certainly, Cicero stands among all *velut inter ignis luna minores*. Yet, to make for once a raid into foreign territory, let us note that all study of French ought to lead up to Racine, Corneille, Molière, Montesquieu, and Voltaire, and in German to Goethe and Schiller. Similarly, the study of Latin ought to culminate in the reading of the three authors who not only are preeminent each in his own field, but, under the guidance of fortune, also mark the highest development of the Latin language in purity of form and constructions and in excellence of style. In other words, if we are looking for satisfaction of both the immediate and the ultimate objectives, can we find in the whole range of Roman literature any other period or any other men whose works satisfy so completely all these demands as do Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil?

Divergent opinions, it is true, may arise concerning the proportion of time to be given to each of these three authors during the three years commonly allotted in our Schools to reading of Latin. I am, to my sorrow, practically acquainted with the troubles besetting the student who comes from the ordinary Beginner's Book to the *De Bello Gallico*, and I believe that the Report is right in postponing the reading of undiluted Caesar to the fourth term, although I would rather see simplified Caesar, comprising Book 1, than selections from other authors or 'made' Latin. What of the remainder of the year? Believing, as I do, in training for power, I want no rigid prescription at all of stated selections, but would leave to the teacher of the individual class the difficult task of making selections, for, as I see it, not everything in Caesar appeals to every student. But, if you believe that as yet too many teachers lack the necessary scholarship for making their own selections, why would it not be feasible to offer them a large and varied number of selections, both from the *De Bello Gallico* and from the *De Bello Civili*? Only I should like to emphasize one thing: the maker of such a textbook ought to work hand in hand with a sensible psychologist of adolescence, for I think we have thus far forgotten to ask ourselves this question, Precisely what is it that appeals to the boy or the girl of fourteen to sixteen years of age? I also want again to state my firm conviction that uniformity in education is a great evil. Conceivably boys need different treatment from girls, conceivably the student growing up on the wide plains or among the mountains of the West may require something different from the student in our own East, and almost certainly the pupils in the large city ought to be differentiated from those

of the country town. Such procedure—to me ideal—is, of course, impossible under the system of rigid prescription hitherto in vogue. I can only hope that the new freedom heralded by the changed requirements of the College Entrance Examination Board will not remain a mere name and symbol.

I am still more conservative when we deal with the third year. The old established selection seems to me almost ideal. It may be urged that the emphasis on the Catilinarian conspiracy gives a distorted view both of the importance of the event and of the oratorical power of Cicero. The former objection is supported somewhat by fact. Yet, whether you are radical or capitalist, you will grant that what we are witnessing, both in our own land and in Britain, Russia, India, and China, makes the study of Catiline one of the most modern appeal. As for Cicero's power, I know of no more illuminating diversity than exists between the invective of the First Catilinarian Oration and the restrained fire of the fourth, and between both and the appeal to mob psychosis in the second and the third. In spite of all objections on account of coarseness, I consider it a pity that squeamishness should have excluded the Second Catilinarian Oration from our usual curriculum. About the *De Imperio* I think we are all agreed. The *Archias* appeals to me more and more, because of its fine appreciation of literature as an elevating influence.

There is, indeed, a practical difficulty, the amount to be read. It is certainly impossible to cover the six speeches. Something must be omitted. But here again I urge discrimination and individualization. To some types of students the *Archias* may appeal less, to others the Catilinarians will remain a sealed book. If the teacher wishes to limit himself to five speeches, it may well be advisable to resort to substitution. In one or the other of the *Philippi*, the *Milo*, the *Roscius Amerinus*, *Deiotarus*, *Ligarius*, *Marcellus*, there is a sufficiently wide choice; but the *De Imperio* should under all conditions be read, not only for the subject matter, but for the admirable clearness of its presentation. I am not mentioning selections from speeches, because an oration, certainly an ancient oration, is a work of art and ought to be understood and appreciated as such; it should not be studied, it can not be studied, as a torso and in fragments.

When we come to the fourth year, hardly anybody, I judge, will fail to include Vergil. The Report, indeed, recommends not less than 100 Teubner pages selected from a very varied list, but, if it is arranged *a minore ad maius*, the fact that it mentions Vergil last may be significant. I know that many desire to read some Ovid, especially as an introduction to the *Aeneid*. My own teaching experience as well as that of friends does not support this choice. Even though I still cherish the pleasure which to me, a boy twelve years old, in the Gymnasium, the Siebelis selections from Ovid gave, I have found Ovid hard to teach,

mately 25 per cent., are found in Class 1, the thousand words first in importance. Of these 242 words, 47 are not found in Professor Lodge's List, while 39 are characterized by Professor Lodge as unimportant. This leaves 156, or 64 per cent. of the important words, as found in the vocabulary of the works of the three Latin writers traditionally read. If we add the 39 unimportant words, we find that the percentage reaches 80.6. Certainly, from the viewpoint of ultimate objectives one and two, we can hardly expect a change for the better through changing our reading material in Latin.

Ultimate objective six involves increased ability to learn other foreign languages. In this respect, another modest investigation of mine will be of interest. For an entirely different purpose 457 Latin words were selected as the originals from which French words and Spanish words prescribed in the French and the Spanish courses of the New York City High Schools have sprung. No attention whatever was paid to the question of their relation to the traditional Latin authors. Yet 281 of them, or 61.5 per cent., occur also in the word-list based on the Latin authors read in Schools and prescribed in the New York State Regents' Latin Syllabus. It would thus appear that a double check-up reveals no urgent need for an innovation in the reading material.

Ultimate objective four, the development of correct mental habits, has always been emphasized in our teaching. In fact, our opponents have often claimed that we were stressing this point unduly, and that, certainly, Latin has no monopoly in this field.

I must confess that ultimate objective seven, the gaining of an elementary knowledge of the simpler general language principles, defies my understanding. If the reference is to phonetic processes, such as assimilation, it will be only a subdivision of the first objective. If it means more than that, I am afraid that the pupil will carry away either a very hazy, or an absolutely incorrect, impression. Nor do I believe—and I willingly include myself among the multitude—that the general principles of language are so much a possession of the teacher of Latin that he could use them with any competency. Surely, this is an instance of *ignorare beatum*.

Ultimate objectives eight and nine, literary appreciation and improvement in the pupils' style, may be achieved, as the Report recognized, only in the higher grades, in the High Schools, and then certainly only, to use Quintilian's words, *optimis adsuescendo*. These two objectives thus, far from demanding a change, support rather the traditional choice of the authors whom the consent of the nations and the ages has acknowledged to be the finest exemplars of Latin style.

There remain, of the ultimate objectives, the third, development of an historical and cultural background, and the fifth, development of right attitudes toward social institutions. For the latter I may perhaps refer

to the introduction to the outline of the third-year work in the New York State Latin Syllabus of 1919, page 27, c, "training in politics and economics", and d, "training in ethical and moral conduct", in order to prove that this "objective" has been recognized for a number of years, and that, probably, the only startling thing about it is the wording, which seems to lend itself somewhat too readily to that kind of supervision of the teacher with which the name Lusk was, for a time, so notoriously connected in New York State. This leaves only the third objective. The title of a paper read by me twenty-six years ago before a teachers' meeting, Latin, An Historical Study, clearly shows what great store I used to set on this objective. *Sero sapient Phryges, sapient tamen aliquando*. To-day, I have receded from this one-sided view, and not merely *mobilitate animi*. Assuredly, for the understanding of a foreign literature the background of history and 'Kultur' is important; the student must develop a feeling for the environment and for the viewpoint of the foreign nation. But, while this demand is of vital importance in the study of a modern foreign language, since, in addition to the study of the literature, the possibility of personal and active contact must always be kept in mind because at any moment we may enter not only into private business relations, but also into official diplomatic and economic negotiations with those who use that foreign language, this 'utilitarian' aspect is absent from the study of Latin. It appears to me to-day that the chief value of the study of Latin is scholastic and esthetic. The part of heretic and *negator* is unpleasant, but I cannot help feeling that much of what the defenders of Latin say about its practical value is uttered by them with their tongues in their cheeks and is pronounced more for consumption abroad than within the fold. The great lessons of history and economics can probably be learned better from a familiar than from an unfamiliar past, and the representatives of the 'economic' interpretation of ancient history, I seem to notice, make much use of a process that is the reverse of the common claim about Latin, i. e. they attempt to understand ancient economics through the light of modern parallels. On the other hand, since, unfortunately, the true originator of great literature, Greece, seems fated for some time to come to remain in the background, the mass of High School pupils will have to seek their models among the Roman authors, and the reading in Latin in the Schools, should, therefore, be selected with this idea dominant.

If these reflections appear to you, I will not say cogent and convincing, but at least plausible and persuasive, the proper inferences must be drawn from them with reference to the reading content of our High School course in Latin, namely, that we must make our selections from the greatest writers of the Romans, and in so doing we must have an eye pre-eminently to beauty. That still leaves a wide field

of choice even for the most ardent reformer; at once there come to mind the elegiac poets for refinement of style and sheer beauty of sound and rhythm, Tacitus for his mastery of what Quintilian called the *genus pressum et sublime*, Livy for his Herodotean breadth of narrative, and Seneca for purity of sentiment. It would seem that only in oratory is our choice limited, since, certainly, Cicero stands among all *velut inter ignis luna minores*. Yet, to make for once a raid into foreign territory, let us note that all study of French ought to lead up to Racine, Corneille, Molière, Montesquieu, and Voltaire, and in German to Goethe and Schiller. Similarly, the study of Latin ought to culminate in the reading of the three authors who not only are preeminent each in his own field, but, under the guidance of fortune, also mark the highest development of the Latin language in purity of form and constructions and in excellence of style. In other words, if we are looking for satisfaction of both the immediate and the ultimate objectives, can we find in the whole range of Roman literature any other period or any other men whose works satisfy so completely all these demands as do Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil?

Divergent opinions, it is true, may arise concerning the proportion of time to be given to each of these three authors during the three years commonly allotted in our Schools to reading of Latin. I am, to my sorrow, practically acquainted with the troubles besetting the student who comes from the ordinary Beginner's Book to the *De Bello Gallico*, and I believe that the Report is right in postponing the reading of undiluted Caesar to the fourth term, although I would rather see simplified Caesar, comprising Book 1, than selections from other authors or 'made' Latin. What of the remainder of the year? Believing, as I do, in training for power, I want no rigid prescription at all of stated selections, but would leave to the teacher of the individual class the difficult task of making selections, for, as I see it, not everything in Caesar appeals to every student. But, if you believe that as yet too many teachers lack the necessary scholarship for making their own selections, why would it not be feasible to offer them a large and varied number of selections, both from the *De Bello Gallico* and from the *De Bello Civili*? Only I should like to emphasize one thing: the maker of such a textbook ought to work hand in hand with a sensible psychologist of adolescence, for I think we have thus far forgotten to ask ourselves this question, Precisely what is it that appeals to the boy or the girl of fourteen to sixteen years of age? I also want again to state my firm conviction that uniformity in education is a great evil. Conceivably boys need different treatment from girls, conceivably the student growing up on the wide plains or among the mountains of the West may require something different from the student in our own East, and almost certainly the pupils in the large city ought to be differentiated from those

of the country town. Such procedure—to me ideal—is, of course, impossible under the system of rigid prescription hitherto in vogue. I can only hope that the new freedom heralded by the changed requirements of the College Entrance Examination Board will not remain a mere name and symbol.

I am still more conservative when we deal with the third year. The old established selection seems to me almost ideal. It may be urged that the emphasis on the Catilinarian conspiracy gives a distorted view both of the importance of the event and of the oratorical power of Cicero. The former objection is supported somewhat by fact. Yet, whether you are radical or capitalist, you will grant that what we are witnessing, both in our own land and in Britain, Russia, India, and China, makes the study of Catiline one of the most modern appeal. As for Cicero's power, I know of no more illuminating diversity than exists between the invective of the First Catilinarian Oration and the restrained fire of the fourth, and between both and the appeal to mob psychosis in the second and the third. In spite of all objections on account of coarseness, I consider it a pity that squeamishness should have excluded the Second Catilinarian Oration from our usual curriculum. About the *De Imperio* I think we are all agreed. The *Archias* appeals to me more and more, because of its fine appreciation of literature as an elevating influence.

There is, indeed, a practical difficulty, the amount to be read. It is certainly impossible to cover the six speeches. Something must be omitted. But here again I urge discrimination and individualization. To some types of students the *Archias* may appeal less, to others the Catilinarians will remain a sealed book. If the teacher wishes to limit himself to five speeches, it may well be advisable to resort to substitution. In one or the other of the *Philippics*, the *Milo*, the *Roscius Amerinus*, *Deiotarus*, *Ligarius*, *Marcellus*, there is a sufficiently wide choice; but the *De Imperio* should under all conditions be read, not only for the subject matter, but for the admirable clearness of its presentation. I am not mentioning selections from speeches, because an oration, certainly an ancient oration, is a work of art and ought to be understood and appreciated as such; it should not be studied, it can not be studied, as a torso and in fragments.

When we come to the fourth year, hardly anybody, I judge, will fail to include Vergil. The Report, indeed, recommends not less than 100 Teubner pages selected from a very varied list, but, if it is arranged *a minore ad maius*, the fact that it mentions Vergil last may be significant. I know that many desire to read some Ovid, especially as an introduction to the *Aeneid*. My own teaching experience as well as that of friends does not support this choice. Even though I still cherish the pleasure which to me, a boy twelve years old, in the Gymnasium, the Siebelis selections from Ovid gave, I have found Ovid hard to teach,

in spite, or perhaps because of, his smoothness and fluency. It also seems to me that young people seventeen and eighteen years of age fail to find much interest in mythological tales, particularly when the tales are told with an eye single to rhetorical effect. But in restricting ourselves to Vergil we are still confronted with an *embarras de richesse*; it is extremely difficult to choose what to omit. I once condemned the Grand Review of Book Six as too difficult for the average student; if I had to omit anything from that book, I certainly should cut out at least the philosophical part of that passage, perhaps the whole passage. But who would omit Books Two and Four and One, or even many beautiful passages in Books Three and Five? Here again, in the coming prescriptionless age, the responsibility will have to rest with the teacher, who should adapt his selections from year to year to the caliber and the taste of his students.

You may wonder that I have not said anything at all about reading in the first year. Assuredly, you are not to draw from this the conclusion that I want to revive the antedeluvian age, when to the beginner the Grammar and nothing else was given. On the contrary, I hold, with the great Ritschl, that the way to master Latin is Read, read, read more. Naturally, however, one can hardly discuss the reading content of a year in which the reading material depends wholly upon a mastery of a rather limited vocabulary and must further adapt itself to a limited command of forms and constructions. The Report correctly emphasizes the desirability of making the reading connected; I should like to add, as soon as possible. On the other hand, I am not at all certain that the demand made to choose for the subject matter a Roman *milieu* is justified, if it is to be understood as a demand, and not merely as one way suggested among many. It is quite imaginable that material already familiar to the pupil from his ante-Latin days has a greater pedagogic appeal. Thus, familiar fables, certain narrative passages from the Bible, anecdotes about the heroes of the student's native country may prove fully as well suited to the young learner. In this connection I want to call attention again to the wealth of material that can be found in a book now almost forgotten, but which always impressed me as eminently teachable, Gildersleeve's Latin Primer. The maxim laid down by that master, "a minimum of theory, a maximum of practice", appears to me even to-day, full seventy years after the maxim was laid down, the Alpha and the Omega of success in the classroom.

So much for reading content. I made this my first topic, and have discussed it at length, because this, mastery of the reading of Latin, is the one true objective of our teaching of Latin. Everything else, forms, syntax, vocabulary, derivation, prose composition, is but a means to this end. It is chiefly in these parts of the discussion of content that I find myself

in accord with the Report. There is blessed relief for the teacher in the reduction and the redistribution of the accidence and the syntax. Personally, I might have gone further even than the investigators. For example, imperatives occur so rarely in ordinary Latin reading that I certainly should have omitted them from formal instruction; assuredly, I should have excluded them from the first term. Their occurrence here is explicable only as a concession to the advocates of teaching by the Direct Method. Nor do I consider the locative case sufficiently important to admit it to formal study. Similarly, in syntax the dative with compounds would have been abandoned by me; the dative of reference and the independent volitive would have received short shrift. Yet, in general, the Report marks in this domain an admirable advance. But it is precisely here that it has met with sharp criticism on the part of very able conservative teachers. May I digress for a moment into the field of methods? To put the recommendations of the Report into effect, the conscientious teacher must do two things; he must abandon the 'compartment' idea, which gives to the first year all the theoretical work, and he must accustom himself to the method so successfully pursued in modern language books, by which forms and constructions to be studied at a later time are introduced in ever-increasing repetition long before the time for studying them has arrived. The chief obstacle, it seems to me, to a rapid and complete success of the reform is the fact that such work makes a far greater demand on the initiative of the teacher and looks forward to a time when the crying reproach of our Secondary education, the insufficient knowledge of the subject matter on the part of the instructor, shall have been remedied. To my mind, even the new list of forms and constructions, by the very fact that it is a list, is likely to emphasize a wrong method. I can see very little value in a *separate* grammatical study of constructions which shall all be developed from the sentences of the exercises and from the author, as they are met. Certainly I hope to see the day dawn very soon when the so-called syntax-questions shall disappear from our examination papers, or when they shall be asked only on sight passages and before translation is demanded, in order to emphasize the fact that syntax is a means, not an end in itself. On the other hand—here again I can only praise the Report—exact mastery of forms should be stressed far more than has been the usual practice.

In spite of the sharp attack made on it at a previous meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States⁶, I am a thorough believer in a selected word-list. Not only does success in reading at sight depend chiefly on a knowledge of words and their forms, but vocabulary study can in itself be made one of the most fruitful and interesting exer-

⁶See remarks by Dr. B. W. Mitchell, THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 20.117. C. K. >

cises of the High School course in Latin, provided it is not mechanically assigned in chunks and words are not perfunctorily memorized just before the final examinations. Such study should serve as a basis of class discussion. A few minutes daily are sufficient and will furnish more opportunity for work in derivation and for cultural and historical asides than much collateral reading. This part of the content, outside reading, while it is of great value, has been overstressed, I am afraid, in the new recommendations. It is far too likely to become a home of the lotus-eaters, where teacher and student may browse pleasantly, while they are forgetting the way back to the hard work of earning their daily bread in achieving knowledge of Latin. Both this and visual instruction are at their best when they are sparingly used; they call for great skill in forestalling the danger of sham and superficiality.

In one respect I should like to go beyond the Report. I am a firm believer in the value of translating from English into Latin. Especially during the first three terms there should be much of it; in fact, at first, it should have equal weight with the translation from Latin into the vernacular. It does not escape me that very many teachers dread this part of the work as a great bore and as unsatisfactory in its results. Personally, I have never found it tedious and I think my students did not. But it demands from the teacher very serious thought to keep it well within the powers of the pupil. Much of it should be given, but *in very simple form*; then the dread both on the benches and behind the desk will disappear. A strong protest should be made against the omission of prose composition from the fourth year. It is not unreasonable to assume that students who carry Latin through the High School course will continue its study in College, if they have been really taught to love and appreciate the Latin authors. To expose them to a serious break in their work (through the omission of the writing of Latin) seems to me pedagogically wrong. Of course, the Colleges, too, are to blame. They, on their part, seem to forget that continuity is needed. Experience has shown me the serious results arising from the interruption of work in composition.

In closing, may I say a few words about the five-year and six-year Latin courses, which are surely coming, though they are excluded from my topic as it has been given to me? I desire to warn their advocates not to attempt to elevate them into courses infringing upon the domain of College teaching. The fundamental weakness of our work lies in its lack of thoroughness. Here the great reward of extended time should be sought, not in the *multa*, but in the *multum*.

If to many among you my reflections have seemed to indicate the dreaming idealist, I say to these persons that my thought has been not so much of the

immediate present as of the future, I trust the splendid future, of Latin in the Secondary Schools.

HUNTER COLLEGE,
NEW YORK CITY.

ERNST RIESS.

A Glimpse of Greece. By Edward Hutton. New York: The Macmillan Company (1928). Pp. xii + 319.

Mr. Hutton is obviously a man of strong prejudices. An ardent lover of the Classics and an enthusiastic admirer of modern Greece as a land of picturesque scenery, he is equally outspoken in his dislikes, and these are directed with like vehemence against such dissimilar subjects as Lord Elgin and resinated wine. There is, in particular, a scathing denunciation of the former, and of England, on pages 28-29, 33-34, which is noteworthy as coming from an Englishman, while on page 147 he writes of "this parching, burning, resinated stuff, which the accursed Mohammedan Turk must have invented as his form of prohibition".

His book gives an appreciative account, enriched throughout by allusions to classic myth and story, of his first visit to Greece, while in a short Postscript he gives a few notes on some additional places which he visited on his second trip in 1928. He has, however, an annoying habit of introducing into his narrative fragments of conversation between himself and his companion, which are at times quite irrelevant to the context. Except for Macedonia, Thessaly, North-western Greece, and the northern part of the Peloponnesus he visited most of the classic sites that can be reached by automobile, and also a few that lie off the beaten track. After taking us with him on the voyage from Brindisi to the Piraeus, he devotes three chapters to Athens and Attica, with a side-trip to Aegina. Next come four chapters on Boeotia with an account of a trip to Chalkis. In Chapter IX we follow him from Livadia to Delphi, which has a chapter (X) to itself, and in Chapter XI return to Livadia by way of Daulis and Panopeus. In Chapter XII he takes us from Livadia to Megara and on to Corinth, to which the next chapter is devoted. His description of the Argolid occupies three chapters, and another brings us to Sparta by way of Mantinea and Tegea. After two chapters devoted to various sites in Laconia, we again accompany him to Arcadia via Tripolitza and Megalopolis to Andritsena. In Chapter XXI he describes his visit to Bassae, and in XXII his ride from Andritsena to Olympia, to which famous sanctuary the last chapter is assigned.

The most annoying feature of the book is the dogmatism which is characteristic of the author's statements even in matters about which he has no adequate knowledge. A striking illustration of this occurs on page 274, where, after mentioning his arrival in Tripolitza on the Greek Easter to find the town "utterly deserted and silent", he writes, "At first we thought everyone was dead drunk, sleeping it off, after the usual midnight debauch", and, a little later, "It is strange that the Greek should celebrate the Resurrection of his Saviour by getting drunk". This is a libellous statement

about an abstemious people. It is perfectly true that, after the midnight service on Easter morning, every good Greek breaks his long Lenten fast with a festive meal, which lasts for the rest of the night and at which he often eats to repletion, with the not unnatural result that he generally spends the greater part of Easter Sunday quietly at home. But, as for drunkenness, although the reviewer's experience covers many Easters, and not one only as does Mr. Hutton's, he has yet to see a drunken Greek at that time. Another example is found on page 313, where, speaking of inns, he states that the best he found were "except perhaps at Delphi and Kalamata not very clean—not clean at all, in fact". Thirty years ago such a statement might have been made with perfect truth, but to-day the reviewer has personal knowledge of clean, if simple, or, in some cases, primitive, inns not only at Chalkis, Mycenae, and Nauplia, places specifically mentioned by Mr. Hutton, but also in other places, such as Tripolitza, Megaspelaeon, Lamia, and Volo.

The same dogmatism and the same lack of accurate knowledge are painfully apparent in his treatment of archaeological matters. A few typical examples will suffice as a warning to his readers of the sort of inaccuracy and misinformation they must expect. On page 22 he states that the Nicias monument was located under the southwest escarpment of the Acropolis—a theory that was disproved in 1910 when Professor Dinsmoor laid bare and identified the foundations of the monument near the eastern end of the Stoa of Eumenes. On page 25 he says that the Nike bastion was surrounded on the west and north by a parapet, but does not mention the south side, where the longest piece of the balustrade was located. On page 27, in speaking of the Parthenon, he mentions "the cornice with its metopes and triglyphs", and on page 34 he places the sacred olive tree in the closed eastern chamber of the Erechtheum! On page 78 we read of the Aegina temple, which all authorities accept as a fifth century building, "It certainly seems to be of the seventh century B. C." On page 77 he states that the museum at Thebes "contained nothing but two stele *<sic!>* of warriors", whereas it not only contains numerous other sculptures but has also an upper floor filled with vases and terracottas. On page 151 he places the removal of Kastri and the beginning of the complete excavation of Delphi in 1860, thirty-two years before these events actually occurred. On page 212 we read that on the summit of the acropolis of Mycenae he found "the foundations of a temple, and, partly superimposed upon these, the foundations of the palace", a complete reversal of the real facts.

Finally, in regard to his criticisms of Greek sculpture, the reader should be warned that his judgments are those of a man to whom the primitive and the archaic in art alone make any real appeal. His narrowness and bias are clearly shown in his treatment of the Hermes of Praxiteles, on pages 307-308. To him the Hermes is that amazingly idealized and sentimentalized statue—the amazing fame of which is only a little easier to understand than that of the Apollo Belvedere and its like, now altogether unbearable.

He goes on to ask what had happened to Greek art and taste to warrant the acceptance of

such a work as this, as worthy of the Greek genius which had produced the school of Pheidias, the school of Polycleitus, to say nothing of the far greater and earlier art which excavations have revealed to us.

There is the usual, and apparently almost unavoidable, inconsistency shown in the spelling of Greek proper names, but a word of protest must be entered against such hybrid forms as Sunion (73), Skyllaeon (75), Chaeroneia (133, 135), Kerameicos (135), and Polycleitus (308).

The book contains an excellent map of Southern Greece and a fair number of illustrations, of which some are rather unusual. Despite its faults the book should be of interest to every lover of Greece and of things Greek.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

CLARENCE H. YOUNG

Bibliotheca Philologica Classica. Volumes 53, 54, 55. By Friedrich Vogel (Volumes 53-54), and Rudolf Kaiser (Volume 55). Leipzig: O. R. Reisland (1928, 1928, 1929). Pp. V + 335; V + 268; VIII + 240.

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 18.213, 20.58, 21.183 I gave short accounts of Volumes 47-52 of that very important and useful work, the Bibliotheca Philologica Classica. The work gives a conspectus of the publications (books, pamphlets, articles, reviews) within the field of classical philology, in the broad sense of the term, in a given year (schoolbooks and pedagogical articles, however, are not listed).

The plan of Volumes 53, 54, 55, to which attention is called at this time, is exactly the same as that followed in preceding volumes. For the benefit of those who do not have at hand all the earlier volumes of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY I give here the "Inhaltsverzeichnis" of a volume—Volume 55.

Vorbemerkungen; Liste der Laufenden Philologischen Zeitschriften; Abkürzungen; I. Allgemeines: 1. Bibliographie, 2. Zeitschriften, Gelegenheitsschriften, Sammelwerke, 3. Enzyklopädie und Methodologie, 4. Geschichte der Philologie. Biographien; II. Schriftsteller: 1. Griechische und Lateinische Sammlungen und Anthologien, 2. Griechische Schriftsteller, 3. Lateinische Schriftsteller; III. Inschriften: 1. Allgemeines, 2. Griechische Inschriften, 3. Lateinische Inschriften; IV. Papyri, Ostraka. Handschriften: 1. Papyri und Ostraka, 2. Handschriften; V. Sprachwissenschaft, Metrik und Musik: 1. Allgemeine und Vergleichende Sprachwissenschaft, 2. Griechische Sprache, 3. Lateinische Sprache, 4. Prosodie, Metrik, Rhythmis, Musik; VI. Literaturgeschichte: 1. Allgemeine und Vergleichende Literaturgeschichte, 2. Griechische Literaturgeschichte, 3. Römische Literaturgeschichte; VII. Ethnologie, Geographie, Topographie: 1. Allgemeines, 2. Griechenland und Griechische Kolonien, 3. Italien und das Römische Reich; VIII. Geschichte: 1. Allgemeines, 2. Griechische Geschichte, 3. Römische Geschichte; IX. Kulturgeschichte: 1. Allgemeines, 2. Rechts- und Staatsleben. Krieg und Heer, A. Rechtsleben, (a) Allgemeines, (b) Griechisches Recht, (c) Römisches Recht, B. Staatsleben, (a) Allgemeines, (b) Griechisches Staatsleben, (c) Römisches Staatsleben, C. Kriegs- und Heerwesen, 3. Privatleben, A. Allgemeines, B. Wirtschaft, C. Gesellschaft, Verkehr, Frauen, D. Feste, Spiele, Jagd, E. Masse, Gewichte, Kalender, F. Erziehungs- und Bildungswesen,

Buch- und Schriftwesen, G. Haus, Familie, Ehe, Tod, H. Kleidung, Nahrung, Körperpflege, J. Theater; X. Religion und Wissenschaft: 1. Religion, Mythos, Kult, A. Allgemeine Religionsgeschichte, B. Griechische-Römische Religion und Mythologie, C. Urchristentum und Anfänge der Christlichen Kirche, 2. Philosophie, 3. Naturwissenschaften, Mathematik, Astronomie, Technik, 4. Medizin; XI. Kunstgeschichte: 1. Allgemeines, 2. Architektur, 3. Skulptur, 4. Vasen, Malerei, Mosaik, 5. Kleinkunst und Kunstgewerbe, 6. Münzen, 7. Ausgrabungen, 8. Museen und Sammlungen; XII. Nachleben. Humanismus: Register.

Volume 53, which deals with the publications of the year 1926, contains 4,780 entries; Volume 54 gives 3,821 items for 1927; Volume 55 lists 4,002 entries for 1928.

A very interesting and helpful feature of each volume is the elaborate "Namenverzeichnis" or "Register" (so named in Volume 55), a list, in alphabetical order, of the scholars whose works are recorded in the book, with references to the items in which their names appear.

CHARLES KNAPP

Psyche. The Cult of Souls and Belief in Immortality among the Greeks. By Erwin Rohde. Translated from the Eighth Edition by W. B. Hillis. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company (1925). Pp. xvi + 626.

In THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 23.19-22, 25-28 will be found a very important article, Tendencies in the History of Ancient Religion, by Professor Ernst Riess. On page 20 Professor Riess writes of the work done in the field by the German scholar, Erwin Rohde, in particular of Rohde's

great book Psyche, now in its tenth German reprinting, and made accessible to the English reader in a very good translation. Psyche is a strictly philological-historical book, but its author supports the results of his investigations by parallels from races all over the globe, thus combining the philological and the anthropological method. Unfortunately, Rohde had a peculiar aversion to archaeology, and so he failed to take into account, even in the second and final edition, the excavations at Mycenae and in Crete....

The English version contains, first, Preface to the First Edition (vii-x), and Preface to the Second Edition (xi-xii). These are both by Rohde, and are dated in 1893 and 1897. Then come, on pages xiii-xiv, Preliminary Note to the Seventh and Eighth Editions <really, in the main, reprints>, by F. Boll and O. Weinreich (1920) and, on pages xv-xvi, Translator's Note.

The contents of the book itself are as follows:

Part I (1-250): I. Beliefs About the Soul and Cult of Souls in the Homeric Poems (3-54); II. Islands of the Blest. Translation (55-87); III. Cave Deities. Subterranean Translation (88-114); IV. Heroes (115-155); V. The Cult of Souls (156-216); I. Cult of Chthonic Deities (158-162), II. Funeral Ceremonies and Worship of the Dead (162-174), III. Traces of the Cult of Souls in the Blood Feud and Satisfaction for Murder (174-182); VI. The Eleusinian Mysteries (217-235); VII. Ideas of the Future Life (236-250).

Part II (253-580): VIII. Origins of the Belief in Immortality. The Thracian Worship of Dionysos (253-281); IX. Dionysiac Religion in Greece. Its Amalgamation with Apolline Religion. Ecstatic Prophecy. Ritual Purification and Exorcism. Asceti-

cism (282-334); X. The Orphics (335-361); XI. The Philosophers (362-410); XII. The Lay Authors (Lyric Poets —Pindar— The Tragedians) (411-462); XIII. Plato (463-489); XIV. The Later Age of the Greek World: I. Philosophy (490-523), II. Popular Belief (524-580).

Appendix I. Consecration of Persons Struck by Lightning (581-582); II. Μασχαλωσύς (582-586); III. Αμύητος, Αγαύοι, and Danaides in the underworld (586-588); IV. The Tetralogies of Antiphon (588); V. Ritual Purification (588-590); VI. Hekate and the Έκατον Φάσματα, Gorgyra, Gorgo, ... Mormo, ... Empousa, etc. (590-593); VII. The Hosts of Hekate (593-595); VIII. Disintegration of Consciousness and Reduplication of Personality (595-596); IX. The Great Orphic Theogony (596-598); X. Previous Lives of Pythagoras. His Descent to Hades (598-601); XI. Initiation Considered as Adoption by the God (601-603); XII. Magical Exorcisms of the Dead (603-605).

The Index covers pages 605-626.

CHARLES KNAPP

TACITUS, AGRICOLA 22.2

...ponendisque insuper castellis spatium fuit. *Adnotabant periti* non alium ducem opportunitates locorum sapientius legisse; nullum ab Agricola positum castellum aut vi hostium expugnatum aut pactione ac fuga desertum....

In the phrase *Adnotabant periti* the choice of tense is somewhat puzzling. This cannot well be a case of contemporaneous past action, for the verdict of the experts could be reached only after the strength of the positions occupied by Agricola had been proved by experience. Certainly Tacitus does not mean to imply that the experts once upon a time held this view, with the implication that it no longer prevails.

In like fashion the phrase is used in Historiae 3. 37. 3 and in Annales 12. 25. 3:

...Pridie Kalendas Novemboris Rosius Regulus init euravitque. *Adnotabant periti* numquam antea non abrogato magistratu neque lege lata alium suffec-
tum....

...<Claudius> triennio maiorem natu Domitium filio anteponit... *Adnotabant periti* nullam antehac adoptionem inter patricios Claudio reperiri....

The essential peculiarity of the expression is emphasized by the contrast of *Adnotatum est* (Annales 15. 23. 5) and *Fuere qui adnotarent* (Annales 15. 41. 3). On the other hand, *Adnotabant seniores* (Annales 13. 3. 3) perhaps is different. Tacitus may there be quoting the remarks of men of a previous generation who were no longer living.

In the three passages first cited there seems to be a parenthetical reference to extant written testimony; *adnotabant* may be interpreted as an epistolary imperfect, the time of the consultation of these authorities being antecedent to the publication of Tacitus's work. That Tacitus is not averse to the epistolary shift is shown at the very beginning of the Agricola¹.

Sallust, to whom Tacitus owes so much, provides an example of great interest in this connection. Speaking of the laxity with which Marius recruited soldiers, he says (Bellum Iugurthinum 86. 3):... Id factum *alii* inopia bonorum, *alii* per ambitionem consulis *memo-*

¹I. 4: ...at nunc narraturo mihi vitam defuncti hominis *venia opus fuit*....

rabant... Here again is testimony written after the event, and apparently cited as extant at the time of Sallust's composition. In a like parenthetical remark Tacitus speaks of a suspicion that arose after the murder of the Emperor Galba (*Historiae* 1. 34. 3): *... Multi arbitabantur* compositum auctumque rumorem mixtis iam Othonianis, qui ad evocandum Galbam laeta falso vulgaverint.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

H. C. NUTTING

TACITUS, ANNALES 3.2.1.

Miserat duas praetorias cohortis Caesar, addito ut magistratus Calabriae Apulique...suprema erga memoriam filii sui munera fungerentur....

In comment on the use of the accusative with the verb *fungor* in this passage Furneaux remarks¹:

cp. 4. 38. 1. Elsewhere the accus. with this verb is chiefly antiquated, except as implied in gerundive constructions. In these two places, it is perhaps preserved as an archaic purism of Tiberius².

But, since merely the substance of the order of Tiberius is indicated in the *ut*-clause, it is hardly safe to assume that his original terminology is copied. The case is different for 4. 38. 1, where Tacitus quotes from a speech which he puts into the mouth of the Emperor: *... Ego me, patres conscripti, mortalem esse et hominum officia fungi... et vos testor et meminisse posteros volo....* The force of this example, however, is broken by the fact that, in another speech put into his mouth, Tiberius uses the ablative case with *fungor* (*Annales* 3.53.3): *... sed illi quidem officio functi sunt, ut ceteros quoque magistratus sua munia implere velim....*

The statement that the use of the accusative with *fungor* "is chiefly antiquated" is true in a sense, but it does not fairly represent the facts of the case. Plautus uses only the accusative with *fungor*; so Terence, except for one passage (*Adelphi* 603). With that small beginning, the ablative came to replace the accusative very generally.

But the change of construction did not alter the meaning of *fungor*, which remained essentially transitive in force³; and while the new "style" demanded the employment of the ablative case, the natural tendency to use the regular objective case (accusative) could not be wholly checked by the "rule".

As a matter of fact, the accusative always remained in good usage. It is interesting that such good examples of the use have survived, for it must have been a temptation to copyists in some cases to make the texts conform to the rule of the grammarians. Some examples are here appended, all of which have good manuscript support: Pacuvius 129 nonne *officium fungar vulgi?*; Afranius 390 ut possimus nostra *fungi munera*; Lucilius 686 cupidi *officium fungor*; Lucretius 3. 734 et *mala multa animus contage fungitur eius*;

¹In his *Editio Maior*, 1.356, in the note on *fungerentur* (Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1884. C. K.).

²Furneaux reads *munia* (not *munera*). Some prefer *munera* as an archaism.

³This question and other points involved are discussed at length in the *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 10 (1929), 43-49.

Cicero, In Verrem 2. 3. 199 *quid aratorem... munera... fungi... velitis*; Nepos, *Datames* 1. 2 *militare munus fungens* primum; Suetonius, *Augustus* 36 *quaesturam functi* (compare 35.3); Varro, *De Lingua Latina* 5. 179 qui una *munus fungi* debent; Apuleius, *Metamorphoses* 6. 12 non *obsequium* quidem illa *functura*.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

H. C. NUTTING

PROPERTIUS 4.10.31-32

Forte super portae dux Veius astitit arcem,
colloquiumque sua fretus ab urbe dedit.

The reference here is to a champion who engaged in talk with the enemy, while he was himself safe behind the fortifications of Veii. In a recent study *On the Syntax of Fretus*¹, the fact was brought out that the word *fretus* has both a passive and an active meaning, and it was proposed to interpret the passage quoted above as follows: 'As it chanced, the Veientian leader took his stand over a fortified gate, and secured by his city walls *< sua fretus ab urbe >*, engaged in a parley'.

The traditional interpretation of this passage connects *sua ab urbe* with *dedit*, and gives an absolute meaning to *fretus*, i. e. 'and forth from his city he confidently *< fretus >* engaged in a parley'. In reviews of the article above mentioned, A. Klotz and J. B. Hofmann reaffirm the old view, the former in argumentative fashion², the latter categorically.

But there is hardly any support for the view that *fretus* may be used in any such absolute sense³. It is true also that *ab* is not exactly suited to the meaning 'forth from'; but, of course, with the verse arranged as it is, the preposition *e* (*ex*) could not be used.

As a matter of fact, there is no difficulty at all with the interpretation 'secured by his city walls' for *sua fretus ab urbe*. The passive meaning of *fretus* is well established⁴; and the use of the preposition with *urbe* should cause no surprise to one familiar with the usage of the Augustan poets.

For example, note the diverse ways in which Propertius expresses the idea of means in a passage in which he says that he is no longer to be moved by tears, though he once was caught by that trick: 3. 25. 5... nil moveor *lacrimis; ista sum captus ab arte*.

Ovid is very rich in passages in which *ab* and the ablative are used in situations where the rules of classical prose would call for no preposition. Thus, speaking of the wearing effect of use upon hard substances, he says, *Ars Amatoria* 3. 91, ...conteritur ferrum, silices tenuantur *ab usu*. So of incantations employed to bring down Jove from the sky he writes, *Fasti* 3. 321, ...Iuppiter huc veniet, *valida* perductus *ab arte*. Compare *Ars Amatoria* 1. 510, 3. 545; *Amores* 2. 12. 4; *Heroides* 5. 150. See also Propertius 3. 18. 1.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA,
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

H. C. NUTTING

¹University of California Publications in Classical Philology 8 (1927), 305-330.

²Philologische Wochenschrift, 1929, 283.

³Gnomon, 1929, 601.

⁴See the article cited in note 1, pages 313-314.

⁵Ibidem, 307-314.

*A Series
of
Comments
on*

**LATIN-
SECOND
YEAR**

BERRY AND
LEE

*The
Climax
Series*



No. 9. If You Have Read This Series of

**descriptions of LATIN -- SECOND YEAR,
you will remember its**

1. Lesson Unity—each lesson a compact and correlated unit of learning.
2. Required Vocabulary—meets requirements of the College Entrance Examination Board and the New York State Syllabus in Ancient Languages (1928).
3. Word Study—gives knowledge of important and interesting words in study of Latin and English derivatives.
4. Latin Reading—Myths—Ritchie's *Argonauts*—Readings from Roman Literature—Commentarii De Bello Gallico. *Note that two parts are classic Latin.*

A descriptive circular is now ready

SILVER, BURDETT AND COMPANY

New York Newark Boston Chicago San Francisco

LAST OPPORTUNITY--To Register

THE ITINERARY—New York, Cherbourg, Paris, Interlaken, Lucerne, Oberammergau, the Passion Play, Innsbruck, Verona, Mantua, Rome, Naples, Cumae, Pompeii, Paestum, Capri, the Amalfi Coast, Scylla and Charybdis, Straits of Messina, Taormina, Delphi, Olympia, Nauplia, Tiryns, Mycenae, Argos, Athens, Salamis, Sunium, Laurium, Porto Raphte, Marathon, Enos, Constantinople, Troy, Adramyttium, Delos, Thera, Cnossus, Strophades, Ithaca, Actium, Buthrotum, Corfu, Castrum Minervae, Syracuse, Tunis, Carthage, Trapani, Mount Eryx, Palermo, Monreale, Elba, Corsica, Marseilles, Paris, Cherbourg, New York.

THE STAFF—R. V. D. Magoffin, President of Aeneid Cruise, A. L. Bondurant, H. E. Burton, W. L. Carr, R. S. Conway, R. C. Flickinger, W. C. Greene, V. D. Hill, H. C. Lipscomb, L. E. Lord, Anna P. MacVay, A. G. C. Maitland, W. S. Messer, F. J. Miller, Walter Miller, H. H. Powers, E. K. Rand, J. C. Rolfe, Lorado Taft and R. H. Tanner.

THE CRUISE SHIP—S. S. CITY OF PARIS, luxurious steamer, of the Ellerman Lines, 18,000 tons displacement, 504 feet long overall. Designed for use in the tropics. Every berth is in an outside cabin with porthole. Every modern convenience.

THE TIME—July and August, 1930. Various sailings during June and July; several convenient returns in August and September.

THE PRICE—\$945 including tourist cabin accommodations for the transatlantic crossings and minimum rate cabins on the cruise ship. Better accommodations at slight additional charge. All expenses necessary to travel during the land portion of the Pilgrimage and all expenses on and off the cruise steamer are included.

Send for folder and map.

THE VERGILIAN PILGRIMAGE AND AENEID CRUISE

BUREAU OF UNIVERSITY TRAVEL

29 Boyd Street

Newton, Massachusetts

UNDER THE AUSPICES OF
THE NEW YORK CLASSICAL CLUB

on

Friday Evening, April Eleventh

at 8:30, in

THE CHAPTER OF HUNTER COLLEGE

Park Avenue and 68th Street

New York City

THE LATIN PLAYERS OF HAMILTON COLLEGE

Directed by Professor Cleveland K. Chase

will present, in Latin,

THE MENAECHMI OF PLAUTUS

For tickets, at \$2.00, \$1.50, \$1.00, and fifty cents, write to
Charles Knapp, 1737 Sedgwick Avenue, New York City

Remittance must accompany requests for tickets. An envelope, stamped
 and addressed, should also be enclosed.

Columbia University
 in the City of New York

SUMMER SESSION, JULY 7 TO AUGUST 15, 1930

Courses will be offered in many subjects in the different schools of Columbia University, parallel and equivalent to those of the academic year, counting toward the degrees of A.B., B.S., A.M., M.S., Ph.D., LL.B., and various diplomas of Teachers College, and the degrees of B.D., S.T.M., Th.D., in Union Theological Seminary.

CLASSICAL CIVILIZATION

Classical Mythology	Mr. H. Theodric Westbrook	Introduction to Greek Art	Professor Clarence H. Young
---------------------	---------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------------

GREEK

Elementary Course (Entrance Greek a)	Miss Anita E. Klein	Xenophon (Entrance Greek Cp. 2)	Miss Anita E. Klein
	Sophocles and the Drama of Character	Professor Clarence H. Young	

LATIN

Elementary Course (For Beginners)	Mr. Paul R. Hays	The Odes of Horace (College Course)	Mr. Moses Hadas
Caesar, Gallic War (Entrance Latin Cp. 2)	Professor Clinton W. Keyes	Latin Prose Composition (College Course)	Mr. H. Theodric Westbrook
Vergil, Aeneid (Entrance Latin Cp. H)	Mr. Paul R. Hays	Earlier Roman Literature of the Republic	Professor Charles N. Smiley
Cicero, Selected Orations (Entrance Latin Cp. K)	Dr. John E. Barss	Vergil, Aeneid (Advanced Course)	Professor Hubert M. Poteat
Latin Prose Composition (Entrance Latin Cp. 3)	Dr. John E. Barss	Cicero, Orations (Advanced Course)	Professor Hubert M. Poteat
Latin Prose Composition (For Teachers)	Mr. Moses Hadas	Latin Prose Composition (For the A.M. degree)	Professor Charles N. Smiley
Livy (College Course)	Professor Frank H. Cowles	Roman Epigraphy	Professor Clinton W. Keyes
		The Roman World of Caesar, Cicero, and Vergil	Professor Frank H. Cowles

HISTORY

The Hellenistic States, 337-30 B. C. Professor Nathaniel Schmidt	Studies in the Early Roman Empire Professor Frank B. Marsh
---	---

PUBLIC LECTURES ON GREEK AND LATIN SUBJECTS

For the 1930 Bulletin of Information of the Summer Session, address
 The Secretary of Columbia University, New York City